

Language Learning

A Quarterly Journal of Applied Linguistics

Volume 1, Number 4

October 1948

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| Editorial | 1 |
| On Teaching the Aspect of the Russian Verb <i>Harry H. Josselson</i> | 3 |
| The Use of Dictionaries in Language Teaching <i>Archibald A. Hill</i> | 9 |
| Intensive Russian in Retrospect <i>Edith Crowell</i> | 14 |
| Two English Modification Patterns for Chinese Students <i>Yao Shen</i> | 19 |
| Speech Making and Note Taking as an Aid to Language Learning <i>Edward M. Anthony</i> | 23 |

Departments

| | |
|-------------------------------|----|
| Announcements and Notes | 24 |
| Reviews | 25 |
| Readers' Exchange | 30 |

TEST OF ORAL COMPREHENSION

(English or a foreign language). Three equivalent forms, A, B, and C. Administration time: 30 to 35 minutes. Reliability: Forms A and C, .67; Forms A and B, .80. Tentative percentile norms available; tentative averages of improvement also available.

EXAMINATION IN STRUCTURE

(English or a foreign language). Three equivalent forms, A, B, and C. Administration time: 30 minutes. Tentative percentile norms available. Tentative averages of improvement also available.

DESCRIPTION:

Based working with teaching methods and techniques.

THE TEACHING OF PRONUNCIATION

THE TEACHING OF VOCABULARY

THE TEACHING OF GRAMMAR AND PATTERN PRACTICE

For more ordering materials write to

ENGLISH LANGUAGE INSTITUTE

1000 University Avenue, Suite 100
Berkeley, California 94702
(415) 841-1100

8. 10
Repl.
Almström
8-5-57
Chicago

Language Learning

A Quarterly Journal of Applied Linguistics

EDITORIAL ADVISERS

CHARLES C. FRIES
University of Michigan

KENNETH L. PIKE
University of Michigan
Summer Institute
of Linguistics

W. FREEMAN TWADDELL
Brown University

Volume I, Number 4

October, 1948

BUSINESS STAFF

BETTY JANE WALLACE Manager
ROBERT LADO Advertising
RICHARD ANDRADE, ANN ANTHONY,
ROBERT BROWER, GERALD DYKSTRA,
YAKIRA H. FRANK, ELEANOR
GORBEA, MAXINE GUIN, GORDON
HALLMAN, HARRY JOSSELSOHN,
HAROLD KING, YAO SHEN,
ROY STROZZI Staff

EDITORIAL STAFF

DAVID W. REED Director
JAMES W. DOWNER
Editor for this issue
A. L. DAVIS Articles
LLOYD B. SWIFT Announcements
EDWARD M. ANTHONY Reviews
WARREN G. YATES .. Readers' Exchange

FOREIGN REPRESENTATIVES

NED C. FAHS Director de Cursos
Instituto Brasil-Estados Unidos
Rua Mexico, 90
Rio de Janeiro, D.F., Brazil

CHARLES MICHALSKI
Servicio Cooperativo de Educación
Lampa 879
Lima, Perú

Published by THE RESEARCH CLUB IN LANGUAGE LEARNING, 1522 Rackham
Building, at The Ann Arbor Press, 317 Maynard, Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A.

EDITORIAL

IN LEARNING or teaching a foreign language, one is frequently faced with the problem of choosing which linguistic form should be learned or taught for active production when two or more such forms are employed in approximately equivalent manners by different native speakers of the language. This problem must be considered in the preparation of textbooks, where, for convenience, materials are centered about a single dialect. It is also pertinent to advanced students of the language who may be exposed to native speakers whose dialects differ, in some respects, from each other and perhaps from

the dialect which the student observed in his elementary study of the language.

Differences in linguistic features may be distributed according to geographical area or according to social class, or both. In addition there may be variation in the linguistic forms which an individual speaker uses in different situations, such as formal as opposed to informal or colloquial use.

What can be done in a practical teaching situation to aid in deciding which of two variant forms should be learned or taught? First we must be reminded that a student of a second language will try to speak like the informant or informants who are used as models. Actually the decision as to which dialect should be taught, or more specifically which of two linguistic forms should be taught will be dictated by the dialects of the informants available for observation. Ideally, however, the student must learn to speak like those people with whom he is likely to associate as a speaker of the new language. It is of first importance that the informant be a speaker of the dialect used by the social group with whom the learner will wish to associate and communicate in the situations which he is most likely to encounter. This means in most cases the use of standard colloquial speech as a model. The determination of a proper geographical dialect may be of greater or less importance, depending upon the amount of regional variation in the language, the degree of mutual intelligibility among the various local dialects, and the superior social prestige of the speech of a particular locality. It seems advisable in any event to learn a geographical dialect which is spoken by the large number of people with whom one will associate.

Once the general dialect to be learned has been determined it becomes necessary, as a basis for good teaching and economical learning, to find out the linguistic features of that dialect. The only reliable sources of information are direct observation of speakers of the dialect, and descriptive grammars, dictionaries, and other works based on actual observation of the dialect. Teachers of language are under obligation to become intelligent observers of language. They can profitably train their students to observe directly also. The results will be twofold: independent growth in the student's use of the new language plus the ability to make intelligent use of the descriptive materials of others.

D.W.R.

ON TEACHING THE ASPECT OF THE RUSSIAN VERB

HARRY H. JOSSELSOHN

Wayne University

1.1 The grammatical categories of tense and the notion of physical time do not always coincide in language. This is true in the case of English. Thus, "he is going home tomorrow" expresses an action that will happen in the future, yet the verb is grammatically in the present tense. Similarly, in the statement "he has been here for two months" the verb "has been" is in the present perfect, which is nominally at least a past tense, particularly in a statement of the following nature, "he has gone home for the day," where the action is one which has been clearly terminated in the past. The first statement however, viz., "he has been here for two months," could also be interpreted as one expressing the present. As a matter of fact the Frenchman would say *il est ici depuis deux mois*, "he is here for two months," because to the French speaker it is quite apparent that "he" is still here and therefore the verb should be in the present tense. It is quite clear therefore that in language the way the speaker considers the action is quite frequently more important than the actual physical time in determining the grammatical tense which he is going to use.

1.2 The same is true in Russian. The Russian speaker will say *on zdesj rabotaet dva mesäca*,¹ "he has been working here two months," a statement in which *rabotaet*, "he is working, he works," is a present tense form.

2.1 But there are other considerations in language which determine the formal expression of the verb. Thus quite obviously there is difference in the underlying situations which prompts the English speaker to make the distinctions in verb forms which he uses in the following two statements: "he is reading the book now" vs. "he reads this book every night." It is very doubtful whether the verb forms could be exchanged for each other in these two statements, and

¹ The following transliteration scheme of Russian is used in this article:

а-а, б-б, в-в, г-г, д-д, е-е, ж-ж, з-з, и-и, й-й, к-к, л-л, м-м,
н-н, о-о, п-п, р-р, с-с, т-т, у-у, ф-ф, х-х, ц-ц, ч-ч, ш-ш, щ-щ,
ъ-ъ, ы-ы, ь-ь, э-э, ю-ю, я-я.

furthermore, even if they could be substituted for each other, whether the resulting new statements would have the same meaning as the original statements. The difference in situation as expressed in the verb forms is commonly referred to in linguistics as that of aspect. In the statement "he is reading the book now," the verb form "is reading"—usually referred to as progressive tense in English grammar—is termed in linguistics as the "actual aspect" of the verb, i.e., the verb form indicates that the speaker considers the action of the verb from the viewpoint of actuality as contrasted with the second statement "he reads the book every night" in which the verb form "he reads" expresses the emphasis of the speaker on the fact that the action keeps recurring; and so the verb form "he reads" in this statement is said to be of "iterative aspect." To sum up, both verb forms "he is reading" and "he reads" are present tense forms, yet they are different aspects of the verb.

2.2 In Russian, particularly, the notion of aspect is one which pervades the entire verb system, and the Russian speaker chooses every verb form which he is going to use not only from the viewpoint of tense but also from that of aspect. Thus in Russian there is a profound difference in these two situations: "he wrote letters yesterday," *on pisal pisjma včera*, and "he wrote the letters yesterday," *on napisal pisjma včera*. Both verb forms are past tense forms, yet the verb *pisal* indicates to the Russian speaker that he considers the action as one which is yet unfinished and still going on, while the verb form *napisal* makes it perfectly clear to anyone within earshot that the speaker is emphasizing the fact that the action expressed by the verb is finished as far as he is concerned.

3.1 And so the statement is usually made that in addition to the grammatical categories of tense, person, number, voice, and mood, and the idea of transitivity, the Russian language possesses also the formal category of aspect. A good deal has been written about the Russian aspect; most of the grammarians approach the problem of aspect in terms of meaning alone. It is commonly said that the Russian verb has two aspects: (1) the perfective aspect, or as some call it the singulative or punctual aspect, which expresses the beginning or the end or the result of an action, and (2) the imperfective aspect, which expresses the continuity, duration, or repetition of an action. This concept leads to all sorts of ambiguities and tenuous explanations, which are not quite easily understood by the non-

Russian learner of the language. For instance, the verb *porabotaj*, which means "to work a little," is a perfective verb. If one were to be confined to meaning alone in determining the aspect, one could very easily find enough reasons to list this verb as either perfective or imperfective.

3.2 Fortunately, however, there is a very clear formal sign on the basis of which all Russian verbs, with a very few exceptions,² can be classified as either perfective or imperfective. The future tense of an imperfective verb is a two word affair: an auxiliary verb—*budu*, *budut*, *budeš*, *budet*, *budem*, *budete*³—plus the infinitive of the verb, while the future tense of the perfective verb utilizes its present tense forms to express futurity. Thus, *on budet pisatj*, "he will write," is the future of the imperfective verb *pisatj*, "to write," while *on napišet*, "he will write," is the future tense of the perfective verb *napisatj*, "to write." The fact referred to in traditional grammars that the Russian imperfective verb has three tenses, present, past and future, while the perfective verb has only two, past and future, can be better reduced descriptively to the following statement: The Russian verb has two tense forms, the past and the non-past. The non-past of the perfective verb serves to express future time; the non-past of the imperfective verb expresses present time; the future of the imperfective verb is a periphrastic statement expressed in the manner described above.

4.1 A good deal has been written on the question of how the perfective and imperfective verbs are related to each other formally. The most frequently made statement is that all Russian verbs come in pairs, that each perfective verb has its imperfective counterpart, and vice versa. Thus, *skazatj* and *govoritj*, "to speak, to say," perfective and imperfective verbs respectively, are traditionally listed as a pair by all dictionaries and grammars. But *govoritj*, imperfective, and *pogovoritj*, perfective, "to speak a while, to chat," could be classed as a pair in just the same manner.

4.2 This attempt to pair the verbs leads again to the favorite

² S. Karcevski in his *Système du verbe Russe* (Prague, 1927) lists close to fifteen verbs which are used either as perfective or imperfective by speakers of contemporary Russian (p. 114).

³ These forms denote first person singular, third person plural, second and third person singular, first and second person plural, in order, respectively. This arrangement of persons and number fits the pattern of contemporary Russian better than the traditional Latin order of the verb.

pastime of trying to set up a system of relationships between the members of individual pairs and to show how the various perfectives are derived from imperfectives by means of prefixes and suffixes; or vice versa, to show how the imperfectives are derived from perfectives by the same method.

4.3 But the distinction between perfective and imperfective aspects based on prefixes and suffixes is not sufficient. There are verbs which remain imperfective even when prefixes are added to them: *kasatjsä*, imperfective, "to touch"; *prikasatjsä*, imperfective, "to touch." There are simple verbs, i.e., verbs without prefixes, which are imperfective: *kupitj*, "to buy"; *rešitj*, "to decide"; *tolknutj*, "to push." There are also prefixed verbs which are perfective, *vyigratj*, "to win." This is of course due to the fact, as Karcevski⁴ points out so masterfully, that the prefix serves a threefold purpose in the Russian verb. Added to a simple, i.e., non-prefixed verb, a prefix causes the latter to change its (1) meaning, (2) transitivity, and/or (3) aspect. Sometimes only one of the changes occurs, sometimes the change occurs in both aspect and meaning simultaneously, and sometimes even all three changes occur at the same time with prefixation. Thus, *igratj*, "to play" which is an imperfective and intransitive verb, becomes transitive and perfective, as well as changes its meaning when a prefix is added: *vyigratj*, "to win." Karcevski then sets up his famous classification of Russian verbs based on the system of derivation by means of prefixes and suffixes and makes the statement that aspect is a secondary phenomenon which is evolved in the course of derivation.⁵

5.1 While this may be true, there is a certain value from the pedagogical point of view in setting up a modified system of treating Russian verbs in pairs, perfective and imperfective, in order to minimize the initial confusion of the non-Russian-speaking learner. He should be told first, however, that Russian aspect has a formal distinction, as pointed out above (3.2), that prefixation has a threefold function in Russian (4.3), that the best way to learn how to use the proper aspect of the verb in Russian is, of course, to imitate the native speaker, and that the following scheme is merely designed to help during the initial stages of the learning process. He should also be warned that to speak of one aspect being derived from the other in Russian is as futile as to argue which came first, the hen or

⁴ Karcevski, *op. cit.*, chapter IV, paragraph 16.

⁵ *Ibid.*, chapter IV, paragraph 14.

the egg. One merely compares simple as well as derivative verbs, whatever their initial aspect may be, with verbs derived from them by means of suffixes and prefixes, observing (1) the change of aspect, (2) the change of meaning (elucidated, of course, by examples of actual usage), and finally (3) the change of transitivity.

5.2.0 Broadly speaking, the individual members of the paired aspects of the Russian verb can be compared in terms of prefixation, internal change, prefixation plus internal change, and suppletion.

5.2.1 *Prefixation*. The addition of a prefix changes the aspect of the verb and frequently the meaning of the verb as well: *pisatj*, imperfective, *napisatj*, perfective, "to write."

5.2.2 *Internal change* can be of several kinds. The first of these is the insertion of an infix: *perepisatj*, perfective: *perepisyvatj*, imperfective, "to rewrite, to copy." Generally speaking, the insertion of an infix into a prefixed perfective verb changes its aspect to imperfective.

5.2.3 One can speak of *deletion* if one considers the same problem from the opposite viewpoint. The deletion of an infix will also change the aspect: *vstavatj*, imperfective, yields *vstatj*, perfective, after the deletion of the infix *-va-*; both verbs mean "to arise, to get up."

5.2.4 A change, occurring frequently with both simple as well as prefixed verbs, and which always results in a change of aspect is the *internal vowel change*, i.e., the change of the vowel immediately preceding the *-tj* of the infinitive: *brositj*, perfective, "to throw," becomes *brosatj* in the imperfective aspect, retaining the same meaning. Frequently this vowel change is accompanied by a change of the preceding consonant. This consonant change follows, of course, the normal pattern of conditioned sound changes of Russian. Thus, the perfective verb *vstretitj*, "to meet," has its imperfective mate of the same meaning in *vstrečatj*.

5.2.5 There are also instances of a *combination* of the two processes of *prefixation* and *internal change*. A good example of this is the pair: *kupitj*, perfective, and *pokupatj*, imperfective, "to buy."

5.2.6 It is also possible to set up a case of *suppletion* into which one could fit such pairs as *skazatj*, perfective, and *govoritj*, imperfective, "to say, to speak."

6.1 There remains one more problem pertaining to the aspect of the Russian verb to be dealt with, viz., the problem of the verbs of locomotion. There exists a difference of usage of the verbs of this

group which permits the division of the imperfectives into actual verbs and iterative verbs. Thus, in Russian *on idet v školu* means "he is on his way to school," while *on xodit v školu* means "he attends school." The dichotomy is frequently made on the basis of such semantic criteria as actuality vs. repetition, definite direction vs. indefinite direction, specific action vs. general action and other equally vague mutually non-exclusive principles.

6.2 There does exist, however, a very definite formal external sign by means of which the actual verbs can be distinguished from the iterative. This is the status of the aspect of the verbs of each group when a prefix is added to them. To repeat, both the so-called actual and iterative verbs are imperfective, i.e., they form their future tense according to the manner indicated above (3.2). But when a prefix is added to an actual verb, it becomes perfective as a rule, while a prefix added to an iterative verb generally speaking does not change the aspect of the latter: it remains imperfective. Thus, *itti*, the actual imperfective verb, "to go," becomes perfective *pritti*, "to arrive," while the iterative imperfective verb *xoditj*, "to go," remains imperfective in *prixoditj*, "to arrive." In the first case the prefix changes both aspect and meaning of the verb; in the second case the meaning alone changes.

7.1 It is thus possible to set up a system of pairing perfective and imperfective verbs, as well as actual and iterative verbs, based on form only. Needless to say, a clearer conception by the non-Russian-speaking learner of the threefold function of the prefix in the derivative pattern of the Russian verb, coupled with an acquaintance of the Russian verbal prefixes and suffixes, will facilitate considerably the mastery of the aspectual notion, which is so characteristic of the Russian language.

7.2 And yet, it must be emphasized once more that the above system of pairings is for learning purposes only. The stark linguistic reality contains no evidence whatsoever that this system is true. All the available linguistic evidence indicates that the derivative patterns of the Russian verb are used for the three purposes of change of meaning, aspect, and transitivity pointed out above. In fact it would not be an exaggeration to state that the Russian verb system on the whole represents an area in which derivation and inflection are inextricably fused much more than in other languages, at least considerably more so than in English.

THE USE OF DICTIONARIES IN LANGUAGE TEACHING

ARCHIBALD A. HILL

University of Virginia

[This article consists of extracts from a paper entitled "Some Possible Improvements in English Dictionaries," which was read before the Linguistic Society of America at its summer meeting in Ann Arbor, Michigan. We are reproducing here three parts of the paper which we believe will be of help in clarifying the thinking of teachers as to what their dictionary needs are in language teaching and as to how present dictionary facilities can be used to best advantage. The material will be of most value to teachers of English as a foreign language but it will be helpful also to teachers of other languages whose dictionaries fall short of the ideal descriptive reference work.]

THE RECENT PUBLICATION of the *American College Dictionary*¹ has given us the best short dictionary the English language has ever had. It would be pure pleasure to praise its many improvements, as doubtless reviewers are now doing. Instead I intend to discuss certain ways in which the *ACD* and other dictionaries fall short of the ideal reference work which we will never achieve, but which each new attempt ought to bring appreciably closer. Before I do so, however, I want to make it as clear as I can that I am not criticizing the *ACD*, for which no student of English can have anything but respect.

The practical necessities of dictionary making demand, first of all, that every dictionary give as much information as possible in three related but separate fields: the descriptive, the comparative, and the historical. Each dictionary places its emphasis differently within these three; the *New English Dictionary*² is mainly historical, dialect dictionaries are mainly comparative, while the *ACD* is mainly descriptive. However necessary such triple aims may be, they nonetheless make it inevitable that no one aim will be perfectly achieved. Accordingly I shall simplify the task of discussion by assuming a situation in which only one goal is striven for, the descriptive. I am envisaging a monolingual dictionary, whose usefulness would be limited to those who had a considerable, but still imperfect knowledge

¹ *The American College Dictionary* edited by Clarence L. Barnhart with the assistance of 355 authorities and specialists. Random House, New York. First printing, November, 1947; second printing, February, 1948. (Reviewed in *Language Learning*, Vol. I, No. 3, July, 1948.)

² Murray, James A. H.; Bradley, Henry; Craigie, W. A.; Onions, C. T. *Oxford English Dictionary*, corrected re-issue, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1933. 12 vols. and supplement. (Originally issued as *A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles*, 1884-1928, 10 vols.)

of English. In other words, the users would be foreign learners of English, or native children.

* * *

We should expect these five kinds of information about words from the ideal dictionary. They are in ascending order of complexity: the phonemic structure of the word,³ its morphemic structure,⁴ the grammatical modifications it undergoes, its syntactic habits, and its meanings. It is worth while to review, with varying degrees of attention, how well dictionaries fulfill their share in giving information of these several types. I shall, however, omit consideration of meanings, since the problems of giving all the meanings of even one word is certainly impossible of ideal solution, and such a dictionary as the *ACD* does as well with solving the unsolvable as anyone has any right to expect. As to the first type of information, the phonemic structure, there is also nothing which I have to contribute, except to praise the *ACD* for being the first college level dictionary which gives a workable phonemic⁵ transcription of American English.

As for the second type of information, morphemic structure, no dictionary gives more than incidental information on the morphemes of which words are made up, nor does the public demand that a dictionary should give more. It is true that if one looks at a series of words such as *con-struct*, *con-struc-tive*, the divisions given in the dictionaries will give a very rough idea of the morphemes. But such divisions are, of course, intended to tell the reader how to divide the letters when the written form runs over the end of a line, and only accidentally coincide with morphemes. For instance, the second form must surely end in a morpheme *-ive* rather than *-tive*. It may be objected that the practical user of a dictionary has no need for a morphemic analysis of words, but though he may not now demand such an analysis, it ought to be obvious that such information would be useful. We have assumed that the user of the dictionary is one who is imperfectly acquainted with English—typically a foreigner at a moderately advanced stage of learning. A morphemic analysis of

³ The phonemes of a word are minimum contrastive sound units usually represented by single letters, accents, or other marks in phonemically spelled languages.

⁴ The morphemes of a word are minimum meaningful elements, either a word, as *paint*, or part of a word, as *-er* in *painter*.

⁵ Considered strictly, the pronunciation system of the *ACD* is not phonemic, but is rather a system of key words designed to reconcile dialect differences. Within the framework I have chosen, that is, an assumption that there are no dialect differences, such a system becomes phonemic.

a new word to such a reader, would immediately relate the new word to familiar words which contain the same morphemes. Further, a morphemic analysis would often clear up points which are now confused. Thus at least a part of the confusion which learners experience in handling the *-ics* words like *acoustics* (of which more later) is caused by the fact that no dictionary makes clear that the final *-s* in these words, no matter what its origin, is not identical with the familiar plural morpheme of nouns which happens to be homonymous with it. In short, it seems to me that a requirement for dictionaries ought some day to be that as well as the rewriting of the word in a phonemic notation, there should be a second rewriting which would show the morphemes it contains and point out their boundaries. Such a notation should at least remove the disguises morphemes undergo in automatic variation, though the description of the rules governing such alternation properly belongs in the grammar. Unfortunately such morphemic analysis must also await the growth of substantial agreement among morphologists.

The remaining two types of information about words, their inflectional and syntactic habits, can most easily be treated together. The handling of this information presupposes a thorough grammar which describes first the inflectional classes and subclasses of English words, and next the syntactic classes. The dictionary, as I have said earlier, would confine itself to showing to which classes words belong. Further, the method by which this designation of class can be given is not any longer new. There are already in existence various schemes of description and enumeration which can indicate conveniently and completely, by the use of symbols, the class to which a given word belongs.

It is not my purpose to go into details about how to construct such systems, but rather to point out certain conditions which must be fulfilled before any system can be safely applied in the pages of a dictionary. English inflectional classes must be described separately, and each word given a designation assigning it to its inflectional class and to its syntactic class separately. In present dictionary practice this is not done. If a foreign speaker goes to the *ACD* to look up *so*, he will find that it is classed as a pronoun, among other parts of speech. The reasons why *so* is called a pronoun must be either syntactic or semantic since *so* shares none of the inflectional characteristics which appear in pronouns. The reader is nowhere given this information, so that it seems to me that there is a real

danger that he will construct some monstrous paradigm as *so* **sor* **sors* **som*,⁶ assuming that it has the inflectional characteristics of *they*. What is called for, then, in a completely adequate entry for such a word as *so*, is a statement that it belongs to an inflectional class which undergoes no modification, but a syntactic class sharing some of the characteristics of pronouns.

If such non-existent paradigms as that given above can be dismissed as somewhat unlikely dangers, there are other pitfalls in our dictionaries which are troublesomely real. The most important type of danger results, it seems to me, from an insufficiently rigid distinction between individual properties of words, which belong in the dictionary entry, and class properties, which do not. Among the individual properties of words are the forms which a given word may lack, and words lacking one or more of the normal paradigmatic set are spoken of as defective. The statement that defectiveness is an individual word property may not seem important in English nouns where the inflectional forms are few, and it would be relatively easy and economical to group together all defective nouns in classes in the grammar. But in any paradigm where the forms are numerous there will have to be a separate class for every word lacking a special form, and a separate class for every new combination of missing forms. It is obvious that the result would be unwieldy description, and that defectiveness is therefore best handled as a property of the individual word. Another not quite obvious distinction is that between words whose forms can be shown by their syntax to be constructed with a zero modification,⁷ and words which are genuinely defective. A simple illustration is that *sheep* has a plural in zero, whereas *ethics* is defective in the plural. The importance of the distinction here is that forms having zero modifications are subclasses of the major form classes to which they belong, so that description of these subclasses belongs in the grammar, while I have suggested that defectiveness forms a part of the lexicon.

The *ACD* in common with other dictionaries, follows the practice of making no entries for words which are considered regular in their paradigms, listing the forms only for words which have some peculi-

⁶ A star before a word indicates that the form is nonexistent in the language, or if existent, it does not appear in the given context.

⁷ A hypothetical affix: "The Hindus hit upon the apparently artificial but in practice eminently serviceable device of speaking of a *zero element*: in *sheep*: *sheep* the plural-suffix is replaced by *zero*—that is, by nothing at all." Bloomfield, Leonard, *Language*, Henry Holt and Co., New York, 1933, p. 209.

arity. Now unfortunately the *ACD* also omits, in many instances, information as to defectiveness. The result is very real confusion, unless the reader already knows all about the paradigm. The learner can only assume that if an entry makes no comment on the grammatical forms of a word, that that word has a full and normal paradigm. If one looks up such a word as *spaghetti*, he will find that there is nothing in the entry which indicates that such a sentence as "Please put some *spaggettis on my plate," is not possible in English. Even more confusing is the fact that in some uses the word has a normal paradigm, though it is usually defective. Thus though we cannot use the sentence I have given above, the sentence "The spaggettis made by Brown and Jones are equally good," is certainly acceptable. Indeed, if our user of the dictionary is really unwary, or has an Italian background, he may make a further mistake. A good deal of reading is necessary before he can infer that the general practice in the *ACD* is to assume that a noun is singular unless otherwise stated. In the entry for *spaghetti* the word is described as being derived from an Italian plural, and its final could easily suggest such plural forms as *banditti*. Thus it seems not unlikely that our foreigner might construct such phrases as "a *spaghet is" and "the spaghetti *are."

Some measure of the importance of this sort of difficulty is given by the fact that in the letter *A* alone I have counted no less than eighty nouns which for one reason or another left room for doubt as to whether their paradigms were full and normal, whether they had irregular forms, or whether they were defective in one or more forms. The *-ics* words like *ethics* are a typical class which will illustrate the whole group. The entry for *acoustics* is one of the fullest and clearest since it is stated that when the word is construed as a singular it means the science of sound, when construed as a plural it means acoustic properties. This is certainly true, but it suggests to the reader that he may form a plural **acoustics* for one meaning, and a singular **acoustic* for the other. You will remember that I said earlier that the *-s* of these words was not the plural morpheme. It is true that some of the difficulty with words of this sort might be removed if it were stated that this particular morpheme is a derivational element. Yet not even this would cure the difficulty since only the further statement that both forms of the word are defective, and making clear what forms each lacks, would completely clear up the trouble . . .

INTENSIVE RUSSIAN IN RETROSPECT

EDITH CROWELL

University of Pennsylvania

[This account of a language course using the so-called "Army method" will be especially interesting, we believe, because the author writes both as student-participant and linguist-observer. With comparable materials and techniques a teacher can use the method described here in successful teaching of other languages.]

IN SEPTEMBER, 1945, a year's course in Russian was offered in the evening session of Hunter College.¹ The course was designed chiefly to give language teachers and young linguists a knowledge of the "Army intensive method." Russian was chosen because none of the dozen-odd people enrolled had any previous knowledge of that language. A report on this course may be of interest since it was one of the early courses given to civilians in an academic institution, using both Army materials² and the so-called "Army method." I was, to borrow a term from the cultural anthropologists, a participant-observer. The observation is being crystallized, however, some two years after the participation, when I have a somewhat better understanding of the linguistic principles involved. I have had considerable experience, both before and after the Russian class under discussion, with language courses in various colleges and universities, and consider this one by far the best. Although only one of the group was concerned with Russian in a practical way, the class was memorable for everyone. The interest was engendered, probably, by the triple satisfaction of speaking the language from the beginning, of having the whole structure of the language emerge under the guidance of a trained linguist as a statue emerges from the block of raw material under the sculptor's chisel, and of understanding why these things were possible.

The linguist in charge was Dr. Norman A. McQuown, now with the University of Chicago, and the drillmaster was an educated

¹ The course was part of a program—instituted by Dr. E. Adelaide Hahn, Chairman of the Department of Classics—leading to the degree of A.M. in Linguistics.

² The Russian language materials have since been published for non-military use: I. M. Lesnin and others, *Spoken Russian* (Holt Spoken Language Series), Henry Holt and Co., New York, 1947, (2 vols. and recordings).

native speaker of Russian from Leningrad. War Department Education Manuals 524-5, *Spoken Russian*, were the texts. The class met three hours a night, three nights a week, throughout the academic year, or approximately two hundred seventy-five hours.

During the first month, some time was devoted to discussion of various articles on the psychology of learning, pedagogical devices, and the ASTP language program. A paper was required on some phase of the methodology at the end of each of the two semesters. Most of the time, however, was necessarily devoted to learning the language, since nine contact hours a week were considered a bare minimum.

The first meeting of the week, for each of the two drill sections of six or eight members, was a drill session with the native speaker. After the English equivalent was given, the basic Russian sentence was pronounced by him, a word at a time, then in a complete sentence, each utterance being repeated twice and imitated by us in unison. The first embarrassment of making odd noises being thus overcome, each individual imitated one utterance until all the sentences had been gone through again. The sentences, incidentally, were not watered-down pseudo-basic Russian but were, rather, from the very beginning, utterances that occur frequently in the every-day speech of native speakers. The third repetition of the basic material consisted of the complete sentences only, which were to be imitated as faithfully as possible with attention to intonation as well as to more obvious features. Subsequent drilling was often done with the aid of the records that accompany the text, which are unique in allowing time for imitation after each utterance. After receiving the first aural impressions, we were allowed to follow the phonemically written transcription in our books. The traditional orthography in Cyrillic script we ignored for the first six lessons, to our great and eventual good. Only after this intensive period of preparation were we to study at home and learn the basic sentences by heart. We also drilled the other sentences which were included in each lesson as further illustration of the grammatical points of which the basic sentences were examples.

For the second session of the week, members of both drill sections, presumably knowing their basic sentences thoroughly, met together for two hours. The now familiar material was on the blackboard, in phonemic writing, but in a different arrangement. Certain phrases had

been grouped because, we were told, they had a common denominator. Could we determine what it was? As a rule, we were able to arrive inductively at the grammatical points which were illustrated by the sentences we already could say fluently and with reasonably accurate pronunciation. The summary of "rules" which Dr. McQuown presented to us was then not a mere bothersome jumble of words to be learned by rote, but rather a convenient statement abstracted from material with which we were familiar. The third hour of the session was devoted to oral checking of each student's knowledge of the basic sentences and to further drilling of the supplementary material. There was so much of this material that it was necessary for extra drills and tests to be worked out by the linguist and the native speaker and mimeographed for the class. This fault of our text, which had been written under pressure during the war, was thus remedied. Multiple-choice, fill-in, and reading comprehension exercises based on the lexical and grammatical material in the lesson served to fix that material in our minds for the next meeting of the class.

The third session was held two evenings later, to allow time for the considerable amount of outside work that was necessary to make this final session on the lesson of the week a successful one. It was assumed that we knew both the basic and supplementary sentences, and the linguistic patterns they illustrated, with complete thoroughness. After the mimeographed material had been checked, the real fun began. A conversation which used the same vocabulary and the same structural patterns, but in arrangements which were new to us, was read by the native speaker, usually twice. We were then asked questions in Russian, which were so devised that perfectly colloquial and correct answers were possible, even from our limited knowledge of the language. It was necessary to remain very much on our mental toes for the rest of the session as well, since there followed a conversation period. Each member of the drill section held a conversation with the informant (native speaker), very often to the great amusement of all others present. The amazing and gratifying feature of this final hour of the week was the discovery that we were able to form linguistically correct responses to entirely new sociological situations (though hypothetical, of course, and requiring much exercise of imagination). This process obviously parallels the way a child learns his language, although telescoped, of course,

to a considerable degree by simple dint of the fact that the language of which we were all native speakers could be used to communicate information about the language we were learning. In addition, the fact that the materials were selected and arranged in such a manner as to insure maximum efficiency was another advantage.

The work in the Russian course was cumulative. No bit of linguistic knowledge, once acquired, was allowed to atrophy. Every sixth lesson was a thorough-going review, which guaranteed that one would never again forget to say "Where is the railroad station, please?" or "I was told that it never rains in California." "Who told you so?" "A man from California."

The American Council of Learned Societies in its 1943 survey of ASTP language courses established one hour of grammatical work to every four hours of drill work as the optimum ratio. Our weekly schedule of two hours grammar to seven hours drill proved quite effective, however, when supplemented by a modicum of outside work. One evidence of the effectiveness was the reaction to their newly-acquired linguistic ability that several members of the class experienced in their outside contacts with native speakers of Russian. The reaction was usually an inquiry as to whether they did not speak Russian at home. Complete and unquestioning acceptance of the students by the native speakers was prevented by the lack of a sufficiently large stock of responses to situations, but such a reaction can, it seems to me, still be considered quite favorable. The pronunciation sounded native. Such a result, considering the lack of special motivation for the students to learn Russian and in spite of the limitation of only nine contact hours a week, and those in the evening, is indeed a tribute to the method.

The phonemic writing to which I have referred offered some difficulty at the beginning of the course because things that sounded different to us were written with the same symbol. Once it was made clear, however, that one sound occurred only in certain limited environments³ and the different but similar sound only in other environments, the logic of the transcription was evident.⁴ No symbols

³ E.g., /a/ is pronounced [æ] between palatalized consonants, [a] elsewhere.

⁴ It is of course possible to make different and perhaps equally valid analyses of any set of data, but the phonemic analysis on which the following system of symbols is based proved itself to be a pedagogically useful one:

The consonants *p, t, b, d, f, s, v, z, m, n, l, r*, have palatalized sounds corresponding to them, written with a cedilla under the symbol. The other con-

can ever indicate with complete fidelity the exact phonetic nature of a sound and we were consequently told that we must first learn the sounds of Russian by imitation and use the phonemic transcription only as a reminder, when a native speaker was not available.

Only after we had been exposed to the sound patterns of Russian for almost two months did we consider the traditional orthography. At that time, it was a simple matter to learn the Cyrillic alphabet. It was pointed out that there were three groups of letters, from the English standpoint: there were those symbols which look like Roman letters and represent sounds similar to sounds they may represent in English, (А = [a]); symbols which look like certain of our letters but have a dissimilar pronunciation, (Н = [n]); and unfamiliar symbols. The inconsistencies of the conventional spelling were summarized as far as was possible. A review of the first six lessons with attention paid to the regular spelling almost sufficed to teach us what it was necessary to know about Russian orthography. Dictation was given once a week thereafter to insure our getting practice in writing. At the end of the year, each student was required to give in Russian an oral report based on the reading of some fifty pages of Russian which he had been doing during the preceding month. These skills were acquired at the same time as the oral work progressed.

In the two years after the completion of the course, I have had no contact with the language, but I find that although a large part of the vocabulary has been forgotten, the phonological, morphological, and syntactic structure of Russian remains firmly in my mind.

sonant symbols were *c* [tʰ], *ch* [č], *sh* [š], *zh* [ž] *x*, *y*, and *k* and *g*, written with a cedilla before *e* and *i*, simply *k* and *g* before the other vowels and the consonants. This was the only departure from phonemic writing in the direction of phonetic. The vowel symbols were *a*, *e*, *i*, *o*, *u*; *a* and *i* represented two sounds each, one that occurred after or between palatalized consonants, another that occurred in other positions. Stress was indicated by having the loudest syllable written in capital letters.

TWO ENGLISH MODIFICATION PATTERNS FOR CHINESE STUDENTS

YAO SHEN

University of Michigan

BOTH CHINESE AND ENGLISH use word order as a structural device. However, this does not indicate that all the patterns of word order in the one language are the same as those of the other language. Neither does it indicate that the two languages do not use one or more patterns that are alike.

The purpose of this article is to show one striking similarity and one striking difference between the English modification patterns and those in Chinese, to point out the importance of the knowledge of such a difference both to the teacher and to the students, and to show how a difficulty resulting from such a difference can be effectively overcome.

The English modification patterns discussed here are limited to those composed of words modifying words that function as nouns. Such modifications fall into two main divisions: pre-modifications and post-modifications. Modifiers which are single words usually precede the word modified: e.g., "I have a *red* book." Modifiers which are groups of words usually follow the word modified: e.g., "I have a book *from China*." In Chinese, modifiers of both kinds usually precede the word modified.

In English a single word when used as a modifier usually precedes what is modified. For example: "the *English* books," "the *hard* books," "the *two* books," "the *first* books," "the *boy's* books." When such single words are put together, they usually fall into a specific order. For example:

| the | | | | | | books |
|-----|-------|-------|------|---------|---------|-------|
| the | | | | English | | books |
| the | | | hard | English | | books |
| the | | two | hard | English | | books |
| the | first | two | hard | English | | books |
| the | boy's | first | two | hard | English | books |

| the | | | | | | books |
|-----|-------|-------|-----|------|---------|-------|
| the | boy's | | | | | books |
| the | boy's | first | | | | books |
| the | boy's | first | two | | | books |
| the | boy's | first | two | hard | | books |
| the | boy's | first | two | hard | English | books |

Modifiers composed of word groups usually follow the word modified. For example: "the cover *of the book*," "the boy *in section one*," "the girl *with a beautiful voice*."¹

Those who teach English to students whose native language is Chinese will not have any difficulty in teaching the word order of pre-modifiers in English. In Chinese, the order of modification of the pre-modifiers of such a series as given above is the same as that of English. In other words, each of the single word modifiers in the group given falls into the same position in a group of Chinese words. However, in the case of post-modifiers, the problem is entirely different. Teachers will find that many students use as a pre-modifier a construction that should have been a post-modifier in English. They will substitute "the *of the book* cover" for "the cover *of the book*," "the *in section one* boy" for "the boy *in section one*," "the *with a beautiful voice* girl" for "the girl *with a beautiful voice*."²

Teachers of English who know the difference between the modification pattern in Chinese and that in English will be able to point out to the students that word-group modifiers that are pre-modifiers in Chinese are post-modifiers in English. By pointing out the difference, the teacher will find it easier to get the problem across to the students. By knowing the difference, the students will find it easier to learn the foreign language.

Before the teacher drills the students orally, it is advisable for him to explain to them the pattern to be practiced. The following method is proposed to handle the question of the teaching of English post-modifiers to Chinese students. The teacher puts the following pattern on the blackboard:

| | | | |
|-----|-------|---------|-------|
| the | _____ | cover | _____ |
| the | _____ | picture | _____ |
| the | _____ | man | _____ |

¹ "The student *standing by the door*," "the man *who came to dinner*," "the time *when he arrived*," "the pie *(that) I made*" are some of the examples not treated in this article. Such structures, which usually come later for a student who is learning English, may be practiced with the same method suggested here.

² Likewise in teaching Chinese to English-speaking students, it is necessary to emphasize the point that modifiers, such as those given, which are post-modifiers in English are pre-modifiers in Chinese. The method suggested in this article may also be used to drill students to use pre-modifiers.

He shows that there are two positions in English that modifiers may occupy. Whether the modifier occupies the position preceding the noun or following the noun depends upon the kind of modifier. Single words such as *paper*, *beautiful*, *wise*, etc., precede the noun. Thus the English speaking person says: "the *paper* cover," "the *beautiful* picture," "the *wise* man." Word groups such as *of the book*, *on the box*, *at the door*, etc., follow the noun. Thus English speaking people say: "the cover *of the book*," "the picture *on the box*," "the man *at the door*." The teacher's examples are limited to this specific difference. After the students have grasped the difference, the teacher goes on with a series of oral drills, for to know how a language operates, and to be able to speak a language are two entirely different things.

The following practices should be given according to the order suggested. Practice 1 aims at getting the students to establish the habit of repeating the post-modifier with the word modified.

Practice 1

Pattern:

the _____ name _____

Teacher:

the name _____ of the book

Student A:

the name of the book

All students:

the name of the book

Teacher:

the pencil _____ in the drawer

Student B:

the pencil in the drawer

All students:

the pencil in the drawer

Teacher:

the box _____ on the floor

Student C:

the box on the floor

All students:

the box on the floor

After the students have acquired the desired fluency, the teacher proceeds with the following exercise in which the students have to change the word order.

Practice 2

Pattern:

the _____ desk _____

Teacher:

in the corner _____ the desk

Student A:

the desk in the corner

All students:

the desk in the corner

Teacher:

on the street _____ the cars

Student B:

the cars on the street

All students:

the cars on the street

Teacher:

of the student _____ the name

Student C:

the name of the student

All students:

the name of the student

By now the students should have control over the desired word order. The teacher goes on with the following exercise in which the students have to distinguish the positions that different modifiers occupy.

Practice 3

Pattern:

the _____ material _____

| | | |
|---------------|--------------------------|-------------|
| Teacher: | the material | red |
| Student A: | the red material | |
| All students: | the red material | |
| Teacher: | the material | of the coat |
| Student B: | the material of the coat | |
| All students: | the material of the coat | |
| Teacher: | in the bottle | the ink |
| Student C: | the ink in the bottle | |
| All students: | the ink in the bottle | |
| Teacher: | the ink | blue |
| Student D: | the blue ink | |
| All students: | the blue ink | |

After the students are sure of the position of single word modifiers and that of modifiers composed of a group of words, the teacher repeats the explanation he gave for the different positions of different modifiers. The following exercise is given to test whether the students have grasped the essential point of the whole series of exercises. In the following exercise the students have to distinguish the positions of pre-modifiers and post-modifiers when both are given.

Practice 4

Pattern:

the _____ books _____

| | | |
|---------------|------------------------------------|-------------|
| Teacher: | big | on the desk |
| Student A: | the big books on the desk | |
| All students: | the big books on the desk | |
| Teacher: | black | in the case |
| Student B: | the black books in the case | |
| All students: | the black books in the case | |
| Teacher: | at the store | interesting |
| Student C: | the interesting books at the store | |
| All students: | the interesting books at the store | |

SPEECH MAKING AND NOTE TAKING AS AN AID TO LANGUAGE LEARNING

EDWARD M. ANTHONY

University of Michigan

AN INABILITY to handle longer utterances is a frequent difficulty of foreign students of English. In many laboratory classes in the practice of the patterns of English, the emphasis is on short sentences unrelated in meaning. There is little attempt to have the student organize and present a long speech. The stress is on the automatic reproduction of certain basic patterns of the English language. This practice is, of course, of the utmost importance, especially to the beginner, and should be continued throughout the student's English courses. However, there is also a need for practice in longer speeches, particularly for professional men who will be continuing their studies after acquiring English.

Another necessity for this type of foreign student is experience in taking accurate notes in a language other than his own. The student who translates an English lecture in order to take notes in his own language has a two-fold task. After taking such notes, he must then translate them back into English for purposes of later research, examination, or recitation. If he has had no practice in note taking in English, he must spend valuable time learning to do it, and may miss important points of his course. Note-taking practice is thus legitimate material for any course which purports to orient a student into an American academic environment.

One method of accomplishing both these objectives has been used with success in some of the classes of the English Language Institute of the University of Michigan. Of the five class hours per week spent in vocabulary class, one was set aside for four-minute speeches by the members of the class.¹ Such general topics as "My Trip to the United States," "Industry in My Country," "Agriculture in My Country," were assigned for the early weeks of the course. Later the student was encouraged to choose his own topic from his particular field. He was also allowed to lengthen the time of his speech until he could handle longer connected discourse. The student

¹ Of the twenty class hours per week at the Institute, five each are devoted to Pronunciation, Grammar, Vocabulary, and Pattern Practice.

was not permitted to read his speech. The end aimed at was not skill in reading, but ability in speaking. He was allowed to speak either without notes or with no more than he could write on a small filing card.

While one student spoke, another took notes on the speech so that practice in note taking was occurring at the same time. The speech making aided the student in discovering how well he was understood by his classmates. The note taking helped him to find out how easily he understood *them*. Thus, at the end of one class hour, each student had had opportunity to speak and take notes, and opportunity to judge himself in production and comprehension.

The exercise did not end here. The teacher required either that the student hand in his notes at the end of the class or that he use those notes as a basis for writing a composition for a later class meeting. The teacher also took notes on the speeches, both for more valid correction of notes and compositions, and for exercises based on mistakes made in the presentation of the speeches.

Such a project as this is useful not only for foreign students of English, but could also be used to advantage in any language course where the aim is facility in oral production and aural comprehension. It is of use in giving the student confidence in expressing himself at length in a language not his own and provides an integrated practice in speaking, note taking, and composition writing.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND NOTES

David W. Reed and Alva L. Davis, who were among the group which conceived the plan of *Language Learning* and helped guide the journal through its first year, have left the editorial staff for teaching positions. Dr. Reed, who has served as editorial director, is now teaching at the University of California. Dr. Davis, who was in charge of articles, is at Western Reserve University.

REVIEWS

PITTMAN, DEAN. *Practical Linguistics*. Cleveland: Mid-Missions, 1948. xiii + 229 pp.

A student of linguistics or of the teaching of languages soon becomes aware of the importance of the missionary call as the motive for gathering information about little-known languages and imparting literacy to previously non-literate cultures. To the various proselyting religions is originally due the present literacy, along with the various writing systems, of such diverse cultures as the British Isles, Malaya, Burma, and the Soviet Union. More recently the urge to provide Bible translations for various aboriginal languages has drawn into linguistic science some of our most brilliant analysts and some of our most successful language teachers. Furthermore, the recent period of successful experimentation with various methods of applying modern linguistic methods to the teaching of languages has needed a summing-up in terms not too technical for an intelligent layman. For both of these reasons, any examination of *Practical Linguistics* should be interesting and provocative.

The author, Dean Pittman, speaks from his experience as a missionary in Peru, and from having used the materials of his text in training other missionaries to work with aboriginal languages. Its aim is severely practical: to help a missionary acquire a working knowledge of a language so that he may make a translation of the Bible. Nevertheless, it can be used in training a linguist to work in the field. The tone of the book suggests a doctrinal and cultural attitude which may not be welcomed by some linguists or by some church groups. This review, however, is not concerned with the problems created by such an attitude, but with the effectiveness with which the book presents techniques for obtaining linguistic information and putting it to practical use.

Of the ten chapters of the book, eight (I. Introduction, II. Phonetics, III. Phonemics, IV. Grammar, V. Semantics, VI. Grammatical Analysis, VII. Field Techniques, X. Sample Grammar) are concerned with the acquisition and organization of data. Chapters VIII, Translation, and IX, Teaching the Native to Read, deal with two ways in which the material acquired in the field may be applied. The appendix contains a bibliography, a list of linguistic schools, a list of New Testament weights and measures with U.S. and metric equivalents, a list of metric weights with U.S. equivalents, a glossary of New Testament special and religious terms, a system for transliteration of Greek, and treatment of a few linguistic problems that could preferably have been included in the book proper, i.e., a phonemic transcription of English,¹ notes

¹ A chart of English phonemes and their articulatory description appears on pp. 68-69.

on the geographical distribution of sounds, criteria of words and compounds, an outline of a suggested linguistics course, and a glossary of other linguistic terms equivalent to those terms used in the book.

The indebtedness of the author to other linguists, especially to the missionary group associated with the Summer Institute of Linguistics, is apparent and freely admitted. Especially in the first six chapters will one recognize similarities to the approach developed in Pike's *Phonemics* and Nida's *Morphology*. The chapters on phonetics and phonemics are the longest of the book, and linguistically sophisticated readers will wish they had been abbreviated, but considering the audience for which the book is primarily designed, any less detailed treatment would have been a mistake. Phonetic and phonemic techniques will help the beginner cope with the tremendous variety of sounds in the speech of his informants; the progress of his other work will go on much more rapidly when he can handle with some assurance the phonemic system of the language he is studying. One would suggest that the chapter on grammar be expanded, and that the chapter on grammatical analysis be combined with it in future editions. One misses the profusion of exercises given in Pike's and Nida's books; presumably the exercises in these books would be used to supplement *Practical Linguistics* in any course designed for teaching missionaries. The chapter on semantics is brief but suggestive; its brevity indicates what most linguists will readily concede, that linguistic science has not, so far, concerned itself sufficiently with the problems of meaning. The final chapter, a sample grammar of an imaginary language, illustrates a skillful use of a technique with which Nida has made students familiar.

The chapter on field methods should be helpful to all linguists planning to work with unrecorded languages. Experienced field workers will of course be familiar with the suggestions on procedure and on dealing with informants, but too often this experience has been gained only after an unnecessary amount of fumbling and tension. The author's exposition of the monolingual approach will interest those who know about it only from hearsay or from witnessing one of Pike's demonstrations.

The chapter on teaching the native to read is, pedagogically, the most interesting part of the book. For those who have grown up in literate cultures, it is difficult to realize the limitations of a culture whose language has never been reduced to writing. Two successful methods of approaching the problem are described in some detail, along with devices for making the introductory stages of the learning process more interesting.

Although the expressed objective of the book is to train missionaries in the translation of the Bible into native languages, the chapter on translation does not seem too well integrated with the rest of the book. It also overlooks the fact that translation is an art as well as a technical operation; the translation of any book of literary value should be in appropriate style, and translating the various parts of the Bible into a new language would seem to require a

command of the stylistics of the native speech so that simple narrative, chronicle, myth, poetry, aphorism, and law are appropriately rendered to the native. Literary skill and the command of the various literary forms are not likely to be possessed by every field worker, to say nothing of every native informant. The task of translation should not be postponed indefinitely by the search for this ideal combination, but the objective should certainly be kept in mind.

In addition to a commendable realistic attitude, that is, using a language as it is, rather than as one might desire it, there are several details very well presented. The emphasis on non-English sounds in the teaching of phonetics is particularly wise. And one who has wrestled with the mathematically terse presentation of some recent linguistic sketches will welcome Pittman's insistence that the grammatical sketch should be intelligible, even if some conciseness is thereby sacrificed. The treatment of the distinction between verb and noun is very well done.

Of course, the reader will probably disagree with some details of presentation in any general text such as this. Perhaps the greatest number of objections will be raised to Pittman's practice of giving only the name of the linguist from whose work details about particular languages have been derived, rather than a full reference. Of course the linguist in the field will not have access to these works, but the reference would be advantageous during his period of training.

Some minor objections: It seems inaccurate to label "I haven't got any" as substandard English. In Korean, /b, d, g, j/ are not separate phonemes but intervocalic allophones of single /p, t, k, c/. Among modern English versions of the New Testament, he should include the 1941 revision of the Challoner-Reims version by the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine. The traditional King James and Douay versions, though less "scientific," also have their literary merits as models. Sapir's *Language* and Sturtevant's *Introduction to Linguistic Science* should be included for general background. Indiana and Pennsylvania belong in the list of linguistic schools. The map of trade languages shows Japanese as the trade language in Formosa, Cantonese in Siam and (shades of the Un-American Activities Committee!) Russian in the Aleutians. The Linguistic Society of America, as a society, has no "trend" in phonetic notation as the book states.

But details like these should not blind one to the value of the book. It is sound and it is practical. Undoubtedly better books of this kind will be written—in later editions Pittman will probably do much to iron out the rough spots in this work—but for the moment this is a useful book designed for the training of linguists in the field, and every linguist should at least examine it.

*Linguistic Atlas of the
United States and Canada*

RAVEN I. McDAVID

Programas de Inglés y Guía Didáctica. Lima, Perú: Workshop de Inglés, Ministerio de Educación Pública, 1948. 132 pp.

The product of a workshop in Lima, Peru, this comprehensive three year program for teaching English as a foreign language is written in Spanish for the use of teachers and administrators. It is a guide for teachers. The primary purpose of the program, as stated in the report, is a rapid comprehension of the written language, but oral comprehension and oral practice are emphasized, especially in the first year's work. The report is presented in three parts. The first is a general outline of the program for the three year period, stating the objectives, material to be taught, and the distribution of class time. The second contains detailed suggestions for the material to be covered in the first year which is divided into five areas: conversation, pronunciation, vocabulary, reading, and grammar. The third gives specific teaching techniques for these five areas.

The book reflects the scientific approach to language teaching in its emphasis on the comparison of English and Spanish with stress laid upon the points where the two languages differ. For example, fixed word order in English is emphasized in contrast to the comparatively free order of words in Spanish. In teaching English pronunciation, the sounds which do not exist in Spanish are separated from those that have some resemblance to Spanish sounds, and the corresponding difficulties are thus more clearly revealed.

The exposition of the grammar materials is by examples illustrating the structural patterns rather than the rules. These patterns are presented in frames which allow substitution of forms. Such forms are generally shown in utterances rather than in isolation. No purely descriptive statements of the patterns are included. Contrast is used effectively in pointing out various structural patterns. "He is an aviator," for example, is contrasted with "He isn't an aviator" to show the difference between an affirmative and a negative statement.

The pronunciation materials emphasize problems of stress, intonation, and rhythm as well as the sounds of English. The intonation markings of questions that call for "yes" or "no" answers, however, are somewhat confusing. For example, in a question such as "Are you going?" we are told to raise the pitch of our voice on the last accented syllable and not to lower the voice thereafter. What actually happens in a sentence of this type is that most native speakers raise the pitch on the *final* syllable (which may or may not be accented).¹ If we *should* raise the pitch on a syllable other than the last, we raise the pitch again on the final syllable. This double rise, in fact, is quite common.² The fact that intonation is incorporated in this work, however, is a progressive step, and this criticism is a minor one.

¹ Kenneth L. Pike, *The Intonation of American English*, University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 1947, p. 52.

² *Ibid.*, p. 75.

The vocabulary guide is based primarily on "The General Service List" of *The Interim Report on Vocabulary Selection*³ and should prove helpful to teachers who do not have such a list. The bibliography also should be useful to teachers of English as a foreign language.

The entire report reveals the guidance of Charles Michalski, English specialist for the Workshop, and the pronunciation materials contained therein are his own. The scientific approach and many of the teaching techniques and methods reflect the influence of the principles set forth by Charles C. Fries in *Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language*.⁴ Much of the specific material in this report can be found in greater detail and fuller development in the textbooks prepared by C. C. Fries and his staff and used at the English Language Institute of the University of Michigan. Michalski, a former member of the staff of the English Language Institute, has incorporated much of the description of English and many of the teaching techniques of the Institute materials in this workshop program.

B.J.W.

³ P. S. King & Son, Ltd., London, 1936.

⁴ University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 1947.

READERS' EXCHANGE

Dear Sirs:

Thank you very much for the copy of the first issue of *Language Learning* which I have just received and glanced through. It is, as you say, entirely a journal of applied linguistics, a phrase which we have needed to describe such work and which I shall use . . .

School of Oriental and African Studies
University of London

Yours truly,
J. R. Firth

Dear Sirs:

. . . I also want to congratulate you for your excellent publication, *Language Learning*. It is practical, non-technical and stimulating. I plan to use it in my Phonetics classes next winter, especially such articles as, "The Importance of the Native Language in Foreign Language Learning" by D. W. Reed, R. Lado, and Yao Shen in the January issue.

Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Yours truly,
Walter Lehn

Dear Sirs:

As a footnote to Charles C. Fries's analysis of "*Have* as a Function Word," I should like to add a phonetic observation of my own for possible verification by other readers.

In my own dialect, at least, the word spelled "have," when it expresses necessity or obligation (Fries's No. 1), is distinguished phonetically by assimilation to the following "t" of the particle "to." Thus in the sentence "I have to do it" the pronunciation is invariably [hæftu] except in overprecise speech.

This feature is clearly distinctive, as can be seen by comparing two versions of the phrase "the book that I have to read":

Version 1 ("have" with full word meaning of possession):

. . . [hæ:v tu] . . .

Version 2 ("have" with meaning of necessity or obligation):

. . . [hæftu] . . .

If this distinction does, as I believe, occur in the normal speech of the majority of Americans from all dialect areas, then we might be justified in saying that phonetic change has produced a new word [hæf], (or [hæftu]). It appears to me that the occasional pronunciation [hæv] for the meaning of necessity or obligation is merely an anachronism caused by overprecise speech, based on spelling pronunciation.

Since I do not believe the distinction I mention is pointed out in most of the authoritative works on American pronunciation, I should appreciate word from other readers corroborating or refuting my theory.

Clark University
Worcester, Massachusetts

Yours truly,
J. Richard Reid

[Professor Reid is quite right in calling attention to the phonetic distinction of *have* in the formula *have + to + "infinitive"* (or simple form of verb) which expresses "necessity" or "obligation."

I hesitate, however, before his generalization that "... the pronunciation is invariably [hæftu] except in overprecise speech." I should be inclined rather to agree with the observation that this "assimilation" to [hæftə] occurs under stress, and that the word *have* is usually stressed in this formula. If this is true the comparatively few instances of [hævtə] would not be "overprecise speech, based on spelling pronunciation" but simply the form that occurs in the unstressed position, as in the following example with strongly stressed pronouns:

They have to do it and we have to do it too. Let me repeat, however, that in frequency of occurrence the stressed *have* producing [hæftə] far exceeds the unstressed form. Perhaps these conditions appear more clearly in the other forms of the function word that appear in the following examples:

John has to work hard, too.

He has had to begin before daylight every day.

We had to start at nine.

If then the voiceless character of the consonant is a variation dependent on stress and if the vowel length continues to be that usually found before the voiced consonants, then the case for this form as a "different word" rests solely on the fact that the "potentiality" of change under stress is different from that of the *have* in the other formulas. C.C.F.]

Dear Sirs:

In connection with Mr. Fries's excellent study of "*Have* as a Function Word," I wonder if any of your other readers have heard, as I have in southern Illinois and eastern Missouri and Arkansas along the Mississippi, the use of the "causative" or "directive" *have* with the word *to*. Thus: "I had the plumber to turn off the water."

On the pattern of "I asked the plumber to turn off the water," it does not mean "I had the plumber over to turn off the water," or "I had the plumber in to turn off the water," but is equivalent to "I had the plumber turn off the water."

University of Arkansas
Fayetteville, Arkansas

Yours truly,
Albert Howard Carter

Dear Sirs:

I am much interested in your approach to Spanish intonation, as described in *Language Learning* I (3) p. 24 ff. . . I certainly hope you will continue with this work, and produce a workable presentation of Spanish intonation.

Navarro's *Manual* (which seems to me to contain material with more of a structural approach than you imply in your footnote) contains such a mass of data, most of it based on a grammatical terminology which simply cannot be handled by Americans, that it needs re-presentation in a form like yours.

My own feeling is that if one were willing to accept Navarro's norm as standard Castilian and start with it, there is probably almost enough data in his book to supply the raw material, without recourse to informants. These could then be used in later stages of the work for the determination of the intonation of various other dialects. There might be value in the arbitrary norm to start with, as a point of reference.

Clark University
Worcester, Massachusetts

Yours truly,
J. Richard Reid

[Navarro Tomas' *Manual de Entonación Española* would be an excellent starting point for any study of Spanish intonation. I would hesitate, however, to use his material without additional data from informants, because his examples are not entirely suitable to a phonemic analysis of intonation. It would be difficult, if not impossible, with his material alone, to determine speaker attitude, emotional and physical context, or to make the comparisons necessary to bring out the complexity of meaning carried by the intonation contours. I would prefer to base any detailed study on mechanical recordings of conversations with an informant, so that phonemic levels and intonation patterns can be determined from examples in context. A.A.]

of
ass
ot
rs.
as
in
se
he
m

n
d
m
o-
e,
ul
g
s.
s
d
.